

agreed to seek the authorization for 12 new appellate judgeships, 26 trial court judgeships, and 18 bankruptcy court judgeships, over and above the 93 vacancies that exist today. This is going to become an increasingly important matter for the Senate.

I intend to work closely with the majority leader to see if we can't resolve the question of nominations and confirmations relating to judges. I appreciate very much his leadership and cooperation that he has demonstrated in working through the Cabinet-level appointments that we have been able to address so far this year.

Mr. President, I will also say, in talking with a number of my colleagues who want the opportunity to express themselves on the constitutional amendment, I am not sure that our side will be prepared to agree to a time certain for a vote today, but I will certainly work with the distinguished majority leader to see if we can't find a mutually convenient time with which to begin bringing this debate to a close.

Mr. LOTT. Will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if we need additional time, we can have time tomorrow and could even have some time on Monday for debate. I am not trying to push it to an early conclusion. I just want to make sure Members are aware that when everybody feels like they have had their say, we will be prepared to set the vote, whether it is this afternoon or Tuesday.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, if I can regain the floor for a moment to say, given the accommodation of the majority leader, I think it is imperative that we use this time. I was pleased yesterday. I don't think there was a quorum call, and I think it was indicative of the kind of interest there is on the issue and the kind of debate that it generated. I hope we don't see quorum calls today. I hope we can maximize the use of the time. I think we all know the outcome of this debate, so it isn't necessarily the outcome that is driving the interest as much as just the philosophical approach we take to a very important issue.

But, nonetheless, I appreciate very much the majority leader's interest in accommodating Senators to allow for the debate and we maximize the use of the time. I yield the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business for not to extend beyond the hour of 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

Under the previous order, there will be 1 hour under the control of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FRIST addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent 10 minutes be yielded to me from the time of the Senator from New Mexico. I request about 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. FRIST, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BENNETT and Mr. SPECTER pertaining to the submission of Senate Resolution 63 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, in the absence of any other Senators on the floor seeking recognition, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business for a period of up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUPPORT FOR THE FBI

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to voice support for FBI Director Louis Freeh, who has been subject to some criticism in a variety of quarters, including on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I do so as someone who is thoroughly familiar with the work of FBI Director Freeh and of his organization. I have worked with the Federal Bureau of Investigation for many, many years, going back to my days as an assistant district attorney of Philadelphia, when I prosecuted the Local 107 Teamsters and got the first conviction of teamsters resulting from the McClellan committee investigation. I worked with the FBI as an assistant counsel on the Warren Commission. I have seen a great deal of the FBI's work since being in the Senate and working as a member of the Judiciary Committee.

I think the FBI does a good job—not a perfect job, not a job without substantial problems, and not a job where, on some occasions, they don't make mistakes, but a good job. I have seen Director Freeh's work in some detail, specifically, on the oversight hearings that the Senate Subcommittee on Terrorism conducted on Ruby Ridge, where I served as chairman.

Ruby Ridge was a national tragedy. Randy Weaver did some things he should not have done, but he didn't deserve the armada of law enforcement that descended on his mountain in Idaho. That was a sad story, because the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms

unit had misrepresented Weaver's record. They said he had a prior record of convictions, which was false. They said he was a suspect in a bank robbery case, which was false. That brought the hostage rescue team from the FBI and the killing of a U.S. Marshal, William Deacon, the killing of Mrs. Randy Weaver and their son, Sam Weaver, age 14.

To the credit of FBI Director Freeh, he was willing to concede the errors. He changed the rules of engagement, he changed the FBI standards on use of deadly force, and he changed the use of the hostage rescue team. This was in stark contrast to what the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms did. They would not concede their errors. The Department of the Treasury, which managed Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, stood by their conduct, even though it was palpably wrong, as disclosed in the extensive hearings the subcommittee had over the course of 2 months, 16 hearings, and a long report in excess of 150 pages.

I have seen what Director Freeh has done in combating domestic violence in the Oklahoma City bombing, and I have seen what the FBI has done in the Unabomber case. Where the FBI has made mistakes, Director Freeh has come forward and conceded that. Where there was unwarranted publicity on the Atlanta Olympics pipe bomb case, for example, when someone unfairly leaked information, Director Freeh conceded that a mistake was made.

While I applaud his concessions on the unfair publicity, I have problems with our inability to properly conduct oversight on that Atlanta pipe bombing case. We have not been able to move that ahead. So that when I evaluate Director Freeh, I do so in the context of someone who sees problems and has been critical, as well as someone who praises the Bureau's overall performance.

Director Freeh has been criticized on the so-called VANPAC case, which involved the murder of a Federal judge and a civil rights leader. Director Freeh prosecuted this case—he has had a very remarkable career as an assistant U.S. Attorney, a Federal judge, and he left the Federal bench to become Director of the FBI. He was recently criticized because there were alleged errors made by the FBI laboratory in connection with the VANPAC case. The FBI laboratory has admittedly had serious problems. That was one of the aspects that was investigated by the Senate subcommittee on Ruby Ridge, because there were problems with their work there, as well.

As the prosecuting attorney in that criminal prosecution, Director Freeh relied on evidence from the FBI laboratory, some of which may have been faulty. But when Director Freeh found out that that was an area of concern in September of 1995, he recused himself from the investigation of the FBI laboratory. That means he took himself out of the case and did not pass judgment on it.